4

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,251	04/13/2004	Andreas W. Wendker	APLE.P0004C	6431

62224 7590 05/02/2007

ADELI LAW GROUP
1875 CENTURY PARK EAST
SUITE 1360
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

EXAMINER	
MYINT, DENNIS Y	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2162	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
05/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/824,251	WENDKER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dennis Myint	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 March 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *20-63* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *20-63* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *13 April 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 26 is rejected 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 26 in Lines 1-2 recites the limitation *"before **the receiving***". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 34 and 45-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As per claim 34, the claim is directed to *an apparatus for creating a description of a user interface that transacts with a database having a data model containing a*

plurality of entities, the description being created using the data model of the database. According to the specification, said apparatus is software per se. Paragraph 0015 of the specification of the instant application recites "*The invention is a method and apparatus for automatically and dynamically generating a user interface for a client based upon a database model.* As such, said apparatus software per se and does not fall within the four statutory categories.

As per claim 45, the claim is directed to *an apparatus for generating a user interface that transacts with a database having a data model containing a plurality of entities.* According to the specification, said apparatus is software per se. Paragraph 0015 of the specification of the instant application recites "*The invention is a method and apparatus for automatically and dynamically generating a user interface for a client based upon a database model.* As such, said apparatus software per se and does not fall within the four statutory categories.

Claims 46-51 is directed to a system. Said system is software per se. Specification only defines "a computer system" – not "system". A *server* as defined in the abstract of the specification is an application server. Therefore, said system of claim 46-51 is software per se and does not fall within the four statutory categories.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claim 20, 24-28, 30-31, 33-37, 39-50, and 52-63 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e as being anticipated by Galea et al., (hereinafter "Galea") (U.S. Patent Number 6404445).

As per claim 20, Galea is directed to a method for creating a description of a user interface that transacts with a database having a data model containing a plurality of entities, the description being created using the data model of the database (Galea, Figure 3 and Column7 Lines 23-41, where it is clear that a data model or GUI database 302 is received by the modeler 304) and teaches the limitations:

a) "classifying the plurality of entities into entity types" (Galea, Column 5 Lines 23-50, i.e., *In one embodiment, the databases contain compiled product or* ***server components (domains)****. Each domain contains descriptive information which bind the domain elements to their respective GUI representations. Prerequisite tags may indicate the GUI element type such as, for example, single select* ***list box****,* ***multi-select list box****,* ***radio buttons****,* ***click boxes****, and* ***input text field****, or images that present the selections*

options for that domain. Optional domain tags determine the run time behavior of each GUI element such as, for example, whether. or not to display invalidated options (and subsequently allow single selections overrides), whether or not user interface pages are presented as sequential pages or as grouped elements, whether or not pages/groups for each domain are to be displayed and where they are to be displayed, whether or not the domain is hidden (not included in the user interface), whether or not the domain is displayed as a read only form element (whereby the domain selection may only be made through configuration logic), whether or not to include local or specific domain and domain options representations, whether or not and which corresponding images are to be displayed with each option selection, whether or not and in which form an image element is to be updated with the corresponding image, whether or not and for which corresponding help pages are available for each domain and option selection, whether or not and in what form a status text to offer when navigation to each domain is included, and whether or not the domain is required for final product selection (order inclusion; This disclosure of Galea clearly teaches that data model contained in the GUI database 302 contains a plurality of entity types, that is, the database contains compiled product or server components (also referred to as domains and each of these domains contains descriptive binding domain elements to their respective GUI representations. Therefore, domains are entities and each entity describes a type of data structure such as various graphical user elements such as radio buttons, click boxes, input text fields etc.*);*), the classifying comprising:

"determining whether a first entity in the plurality of entities satisfies a first set of conditions; and

classifying the first entity as a first entity type upon determining that the first entity satisfies the first set of conditions" (Galea Figure 8; entities (i.e., user elements) are determined and classified as "*Images", "Navigation Frame" entities, "Dynamic Content Frame elements*); and

b) "creating the description of the user interface based upon the classification of the plurality of entities" (Galea, Column 5 Lines 51-59, i.e., *A user accesses a server through client 106, 108 via wide area network 112 in order to access items for sale (domains) in the product and GUI database. Each product or service configuration domain, together with the user interface tags, is compiled into a secure, binary compressed file format. After a user accesses the domain through client 106, 108, the compiled configuration model is downloaded to the browser of client 106, 108.* ***The user interface is dynamically generated based upon the compiled domain tags***).

As per claim 24, Official Note is taken that writing descriptions in XML is notoriously well known in the art. Galea also teaches XML format in Column 8 Lines 25-67 and Column 9 Lines 1-22.

As per claim 25, Galea teaches the limitation:

"wherein the classifying and creating are performed automatically without human assistance" (Galea, Column 6 Lines 20-34, i.e., *The distributed client-side e-commerce*

*service system 100 allows for the **automatic generation** of a user interface for a particular product and/or service model "**on-the-fly**" such that a web user is always presented with the latest product or service selection choices).*

As per claim 26, Galea teaches the limitation:

"obtaining a current data model of the database, the current data model reflecting any changes to the database up to when the current data model is obtained, wherein a current description of the user interface is created using the current data model of the database" (Galea, Column 6 Lines 20-34, i.e., *The distributed client-side e-commerce service system 100 allows for the **automatic generation** of a user interface for a particular product and/or service model "**on-the-fly**" such that a web user is always presented with the **latest** product or service selection choices*). In Column 10 Lines 44-57, Galea teaches database modeling. From these teachings, it can be inferred that Galea obtains a current data model of the database.

As per claim 27, Galea teaches the limitation:

"before the classifying, receiving a request from a client that the description be created, wherein receiving the request triggers the classifying of entities into entity types" (Galea, Figure 7 and Column 6 Lines 20-34). Galea teaches the client request as show in Figure 7 as well as described in Column 6 Lines 20-34, in an e-commerce system that "*allows for the **automatic generation** of a user interface for a particular product and/or service model "**on-the-fly**" such that a web user is always presented*

*with the **latest** product or service selection choices."* It can be inferred that the use and presentation of the product and service selections of the e-commerce taught by Galea can be interpreted as a request for creation of a description of a user interface onto a client system.

Claim 28 is rejected on the same basis of claim 20 and disclosure of Galea in Figure 1 wherein a network interface for interfacing with a network is depicted as "WAN", "Server", and "Client".

As per claim 30, Galea teaches the limitations:

"wherein the sets of instructions further comprises: a set of instructions for distributing the description to a client via the network for enabling the client to generate the user interface; and a set of instructions for providing data from the database to the client for populating the user interface" (Galea, Column 5 Lines 51-59, i.e., *A user accesses a server through client 106, 108 via wide area network 112 in order to access items for sale (domains) in the product and GUI database. Each product or service configuration domain, together with the user interface tags, is compiled into a secure, binary compressed file format. After a user accesses the domain through client 106, 108, the compiled configuration model is downloaded to the browser of client 106, 108. The user interface is dynamically generated based upon the compiled domain tags*).

Claim 31 is rejected on the same basis as claim 20.

Claim 33 is rejected on the same basis as claim 26.

Claim 34 is rejected on the same basis as claim 20.

Claim 35 is rejected on the same basis as claim 20.

Claim 36 is rejected on the same basis as claim 27.

As per claim 37, Galea teaches the limitation:

"before the receiving: sending preferences for the user interface, the preferences being utilized in creating the description" (Galea, Column 7 Lines 42-47, i.e., *A user accesses server 102 via WAN 112 from client 106. When the user makes a selection as to a domain (for example, an online camera store), the compiled interactive decision map 310 for the requested domain is downloaded to client 106. In addition, a client applet is downloaded to client 106. The client applet downloads the interactive decision map 310 for the particular domain and builds a multi-page graphical user interface (GUI) map by looping through the interactive decision map 310 and collecting array elements for each configuration domain;* Galea, Column 11 Lines 65-66, i.e., *Window 900 is displayed after a user selects a particular domain for viewing;* and Galea, Column 12 Lines 4-6, i.e., *After the user accesses a particular domain, the information is downloaded to the client from the server and the client applet downloaded from the server is used to create the display*). The domain received from the client by the application server can be interpreted as the preference selected by the user and it is clear that the selected domain will be utilized in creating a description of the user interface as shown in Figure 15.

As per claim 39, Galea is directed to a computer for generating a user interface that transacts with a database having a data model containing a plurality of entities, the computer comprising the memory for storing sets of instructions (Figure 3 and Column7 Lines 23-41, where it is clear that a data model or GUI database 302 is received by the modeler 304) and teaches the limitations:

"a set of instructions for receiving a description of the user interface from an application server, the description being based upon classification of the plurality of entities into entity types wherein the classification comprises classification of a first entity as a first entity type upon determination that the first entity satisfies a first set of conditions" (Galea, Column 6 Lines 20-34; Column 10 Lines 44-57; Column 5 Lines 51-59); and

"a set of instructions for generating the user interface using the description of the user interface" (Galea, Column 10 Lines 44-59); and

"a network interface for transacting with the application server and the database via a network" (Galea, Figure 1).

As per claim 40, Galea teaches the limitations:

"a set of instructions for sending to the application server a request that the description be created" (Galea, Figure 7 and Column 6 Lines 20-34; and Claim 7 above); and

"a set of instructions for receiving data from the database in order to populate the user interface" (Galea, Column 12 Lines 10-15 and Figure 10).

Claim 41 is rejected on the same basis as claim 37.

Claim 42 is rejected on the same basis as claim 39.

Claim 43 is rejected on the same basis as claim 26.

Claim 44 is rejected on the same basis as claim 37.

Claim 45 is rejected on the same basis as claim 42.

Claim 46 is rejected on the same basis as claim 20.

Claim 47 is rejected on the same basis as claim 26.

As Claim 48, Galea teaches the limitation:

"wherein the server is in persistent communication with the database" (Galea, Figure 3).

As per claim 49 Galea teaches the limitations:

"wherein the server is communicatively coupled to a first client via a network" (Galea Figure 1) and "distributes the created description to the first client for enabling the first client to generate the user interface" (Galea, Column 5 Lines 51-59 and Column 6 Lines 20-34).

As per claim 50, Galea teaches the limitation:

"wherein the server provides the first client an only point of access to the database" (Galea, Figure 1 and Figure 3).

As per claim 52, Galea teaches is directed to a computer and teaches the limitations:

a) "a description of a data store" (Galea, Galea, Column 5 Lines 51-59, i.e., *A user accesses a server through client 106, 108 via wide area network 112 in order to access items for sale (domains) in the product and GUI database. Each product or service configuration domain, together with the user interface tags, is compiled into a secure, binary compressed file format. After a user accesses the domain through client 106, 108, the compiled configuration model is downloaded to the browser of client 106, 108. The user interface is dynamically generated based upon the compiled domain tags*)

b) "a browser" (Galea, Figure 6, i.e., *Browser Application*); and

c) "an application for generating user-interface elements based on said description, said elements for display in said browser and for facilitating transactions with said data store" (Galea, Galea, Column 5 Lines 51-59).

As per claim 53, Galea teaches the limitation:

"comprising a storage for storing the description, the browser and the application" (Galea Figures 1, 3, and 6).

As per claim 54, Galea teaches the limitations:

"wherein in said-user interface elements facilitates transactions by permitting a user to transact with said data store" (Galea, Column 7 Lines 42-47, i.e., *A user accesses server 102 via WAN 112 from client 106. When the user makes a selection as to a domain (for example, an online camera store), the compiled interactive decision map 310 for the requested domain is downloaded to client 106. In addition, a client applet is downloaded to client 106. The client applet downloads the interactive decision map 310 for the particular domain and builds a multi-page graphical user interface (GUI) map by looping through the interactive decision map 310 and collecting array elements for each configuration domain;* Galea, Column 11 Lines 65-66, i.e., *Window 900 is displayed after a user selects a particular domain for viewing;* and Galea, Column 12 Lines 4-6, i.e., *After the user accesses a particular domain, the information is downloaded to the client from the server and the client applet downloaded from the server is used to create the display*).

As per claim 55, Galea teaches the limitation:

"wherein at least one user interface element is displayed in aid browser after the user requests data from said store" (Galea Figure 6, i.e., *Browser Application* and Figure 7).

As per claim 56, Galea teaches the limitation:

"wherein said browser is a web browser" (Galea Figure 6), "wherein said application is a distributed application running on the said web browser" (Galea, Figure 3).

As per claim 57, Official Note is taken that distributing an application, as an applet is notorious well known in the art, as can be seen Java applets on millions of web sites.

As per claim 58, Galea teaches the limitations:

a) "receiving a first request for a first user interface to transact with a first data store;

b) supplying a first description to generate the first user interface;

c) receiving a second request for a second user interface to transact with a second data store; and

d) supplying a second description to generate the second user interface, wherein said first and second descriptions differ" (Galea, Column 4 Lines 1-5, i.e., *the constraint-based configuration file is mapped into a* ***plurality of pages*** *at a client, and a page of* ***the plurality of page*** *is updated directly from the constraint-based configuration file;* Column 5 Lines 19-22, i.e., *In an alternate embodiment,* ***each of the databases may be contained in a separate mass storage devices 104****;* Column 5 Lines 23-26, i.e. *In one embodiment, the databases contain compiled product or service components (domains). Each domain contains descriptive information which bind the domain*

elements to their respective GUI representations; Figure 12 and Figure 13; Column 12 Lines 28-50, which explains Figure 12 and Figure 13; Also note Figure 1 wherein *Client 106* (first client) and *Client 108* (second client) can access the server for different user interfaces).

As per claim 59, Galea teaches the limitations:

"wherein the first and second data stores are the same data stores" (Galea, Column g Lines 16-19, i.e., *In one embodiment, mass storage device 104 contains a produce component and graphical user interface (GUI) database and an interactive decision map database*), "wherein the first request is received from a first user while the second request is received from a second user different than the first, wherein the first description is supplied to the first user while the second description is supplied to the second user" (Figure 1 wherein by way of *Client 106* (first client) and *Client 108* (second client), different users can access the server for different user interfaces). For the feature of supplying descriptions to users, see claim 1 and 26 above.

As per claim 60, Galea teaches the limitations:

"wherein the first and second user interfaces comprises at least two interface elements for facilitating data transactions" (see Galea, Figure 12 and 13, wherein more than two interface elements are displayed), "wherein said first interface comprises one or more user interface elements than said second user interface" (Galea Figure 1 describes 2 clients and Galea Figures 12 and 13 describes a plurality of interface

elements on each generated user interfaces. Depending on domains, numbers of user interface elements are different. As such, one interface always has more interface elements than other interface).

As per claim 61, Galea teaches the limitation:

"wherein first and second user interfaces are displayed in an application running different computers" (Galea, Figure 1, *Client 106* (first client) and *Client 108* (second client).

Claim 62 is rejected on the same basis as claim 52.

Claim 63 is rejected on the same basis as claim 58.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claim 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galea in view of Roth (U.S. Patent Number 6564218).

As per claim 21, Galea teaches the limitations:

"each entity in the data model describes a type of data object associated with the database" (Galea, Column 10 Lines 44-57, i.e., *FIG. 7 is a flow diagram of one embodiment for* ***modeling data*** *for a client-side e-commerce system 100. Initially at processing block 702, the data configuration domain for a particular e-commerce site is defined. In one embodiment, system 100 models data by defining and binding relations between data items. At processing block 703, graphical user interface (GUI) tags are entered and dynamically generated. The GUI tags are used to define relations between the data and the graphical representation of the data. The graphical user interface (GUI) tags, together with configuration domain relations generated at processing block 702, are modeled into an extended markup language (XML) configuration file. The XML configuration file is saved in product in GUI data 302*); and

"the classifying produces the first entity type for a first group of data objects and a second entity type for a second group of data objects" (Galea Figure 8; and Column 11 Lines 48-63, i.e., *Fields are input that indicate the user interface elements types and*

optional domain tags which determine the run time behavior of each of the user interface elements).

Galea does not explicitly teach the limitation: "the data objects in the first group of data objects being updated in the database more frequently than the data objects in the second group of data objects".

On the other hand, Roth teaches the limitation:

"the data objects in the first group of data objects being updated in the database more frequently than the data objects in the second group of data objects" (Roth, Column 4 Lines 54-57, i.e., *Advantageously, said one or more supersets to be used for said validity check are selected from said specified supersets on the basis of a priori knowledge of supersets least likely to be updated*). Roth teaches supersets of data objects and some of said supersets are more frequently update while others are less frequently updated.

At the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the to add the feature of updating data objects/entities, of which some are more frequently updated and some are less frequently updated, as taught by Roth, to the method of Galea so that, in the resultant method, the classifying would produce the first entity type for a first group of data objects and a second entity type for a second group of data objects, the data objects in the first group of data objects being updated in the database more frequently than the data objects in the second group of data objects. One would have been motivated to do so in order to improve overall speed of retrieval/updates of digital information (Roth, Column 4 Lines 39-43).

As per claim 22, Galea in view of Roth teaches the limitations:

"wherein the first entity type is a Main entity type and the second entity type is an Enumeration type" (Roth, Column 8 Lines 65 through Column 9 Line 5, i.e., *As **changes typically affect some parameters with a higher probability than others**, the version comparison can be optimized by starting the comparison using the parameter with **the least probability of change, e.g. starting with the parameter "country"**, provided that data are changed on a country by country basis).*

9. Claim 23, 29, 32, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galea in view of Sexton et al., (hereinafter "Sexton") (U.S. Patent Number 7093263).

As per claim 23, Galea does not explicitly teach the limitation: "wherein the description is a generic description configured to be interpreted in different platforms or operating environments".

On the other hand, Sexton teaches the limitation:

"wherein the description is a generic description configured to be interpreted in different platforms or operating environments" (Sexton, Column 3 Lines 40-52, i.e., *In addition, instructions can automatically be generated for getting and setting values in the object in the platform-independent format, thereby diminishing the reliance on manually coding the operations. As a result, errors are reduced and the code is more maintainable).*

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of employing generic descriptions/instructions which can be interpreted in different operating environments, as taught by Sexton, to the method of Galea so that, in the resultant method, the description would be a generic description which is to be interpreted in different platforms. One would have been motivated to do so in order to make the code/instructions/descriptions portable, which is a well-known practice in the art, such as Java code.

Claim 29 is rejected on the same basis as claim 23.

Claim 32 is rejected on the same basis as claim 23.

As per claim 51, Galea in view of Sexton teaches the limitations:

"wherein the server is communicatively coupled, via the network, to a second client" (Galea Figure 1 in view of Sexton Figure 1) "having a different platform or operating environment than the first client" (Column 9 Lines 3-6, i.e., *For example, if a platform does not have a 4-byte primitive integer (e.g., on 64-bit machines such as* ***Cray YP-1***), and "distributes the created description to the second client for enabling the second client to generate the user interface" (Galea, Column 5 Lines 51-59 and Column 6 Lines 20-34).

10. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galea in view of Mashayekhi (U.S. Patent Number 5818936).

As per claim 38, Galea does not explicitly teach the limitation: "before the receiving: sending authentication information".

On the other hand, Mashayekhi teaches the limitation:

"before the receiving: sending authentication information" (Mashayekhi, Column 7 Lines 10-30, i.e., *when a user 201 attempts to access a particular application program, such as a local application 240 or network-based application program 236, the particular application program requires that the user be authenticated prior to accessing its processes or data*).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill to add the feature of authenticating a user access, as taught by Mashayekhi, to the method of Galea so that the resultant method would comprise sending authentication information. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide security to the database, which is well known in the art.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis Myint whose telephone number is (571) 272-5629. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:30PM Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-5629.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dennis Myint
Examiner
AU-2162